

REMARKS

NOTICE OF ABANDONMENT

The Notice of Abandonment dated November 28, 2007 states that “Applicant’s representative confirmed that no response will be sent...” While Applicant’s representative may have acknowledged that no response had been sent up to that point (i.e., up to 11/28/07), Applicant’s representative did not indicate that no response would be sent in the future. Please note that the Notice of Abandonment was specifically requested (after the six-month period for reply had unintentionally expired) for the purpose of filing a petition for revival and a reply to the outstanding Office Action.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 -22

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,421,709 issued to McCormick et al. (*McCormick*). Applicant submits claims 1-22 are not anticipated by *McCormick* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 recites, in part, the following:

enabling configuration of a plurality of automatic response email messages, each of the plurality of automatic response email messages tailored for a type of the incoming email messages;

Independent claims 8 and 15 recite similar limitations. *McCormick* is cited as disclosing enabling configuration of a plurality of automatic responses, each tailored for a type of the incoming email messages. *McCormick* is not cited as disclosing enabling configuration of a plurality of automatic response email messages. Indeed, the cited portions of *McCormick* discuss filters for incoming email messages. These filters simply

discard the email message. See, e.g., column 7, lines 55-67. *McCormick* does not disclose configuring a plurality of automatic response email messages tailored for different types of incoming email messages. Thus, *McCormick* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 1, 8 and 15 are not anticipated by *McCormick*.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1. Claims 9-14 depend from claim 8. Claims 16-22 depend from claim 15. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-22 are likewise not anticipated by *McCormick*.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**

Date: December 28, 2007

/Jared S. Engstrom/  
Jared S. Engstrom, Rcg. No. 58,330  
Attorney for Applicant

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: December 28, 2007

/Katherine Jennings/  
Katherine Jennings